



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/007,156 | 12/05/2001 | John G. Sotos | 021262-000110US | 5725 |

20350 7590 05/17/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

ROBERTSON, DAVID

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

05/17/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/007,156 | SOTOS, JOHN G. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Dave Robertson | 3623 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dave Robertson, Examiner.

(3) Atty Richard Ogawa.

(2) Andre Boyce, Primary Examiner 3623.

(4) Inventor John Sotos/Patent Agent Kao(by telephone).

Date of Interview: 09 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Milic-Frayling (US 2006/0059138).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed (inventor) invention overview and origin of inventive concept; discussed issues of claiming and broadest reasonable interpretation; discussed possible focus of claims/subject matter claims 1 and 5; attention called (in brief summary) to prior art in case but not relied upon and art in the field of expert search and recommendation (e.g. Walker); agreement made to proceed to response to non-final office action with due consideration of substance of interview .